

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/479,240 01/07/00 KLEIN

M 1038-1000 MI

HM12/0703

EXAMINER

Sim & McBurney
Suite 701
330 University Avenue
Toronto ON M5G 1
CANADA

NAVARRO, A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1645

DATE MAILED:

07/03/01

AIR MAIL

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/479,240	Applicant(s) Klein et al
	Examiner Mark Navarro	Art Unit 1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 59-76 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) 75 and 76 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 59-74 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 08/001,554.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 3 20) Other: _____

Art Unit: 1645

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group III, claims 59-74, (Paper number 6) received on April 23, 2001 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the grounds that groups I-IV are all classified in the same subclass, so that there is no undue burden on the Examiner in searching the prior art. The argument that the restriction is improper because the application can be searched without serious burden is not found persuasive. It is the Examiner's position that it would be an undue burden to search all Groups as indicated by the divergent subject matter, in view that completely different viral strains (PIV, RSV) are used to create the hybrids, and furthermore, structural distinct proteins have been used from each of these different viruses in order to create the hybrid fusion protein.. Applicant's will note that every hybrid gene ever created would be classified in 536, 23.4, (i.e., virus-virus, bacterial-virus, mammalian-bacterial, etc.) and a reference which anticipates one combination of a hybrid will not necessarily anticipate or render obvious any of the other claimed hybrids.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Art Unit: 1645

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed January 7, 2000 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the cited references by Chanock, and Prince et al, lack dates of publication and/or pages to be considered. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1). A signed copy of the remaining references is enclosed.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 60 and 71 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

In view of the restriction requirement, this application has been limited to hybrid genes of HN_{PIV-3}-F_{RSV}, consequently, a claim which recites this combination is not further limiting.

Art Unit: 1645

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 62 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to provide an enabling disclosure without complete evidence that the claimed biological materials are known and readily available to the public or complete evidence of the deposit of biological materials.

The specification lacks complete deposit information for the deposit of plasmid pD2 RF-HN (ATCC 75388). It is not clear that the plasmid pD2 RF-HN (ATCC 75388) is known and publicly available or can be reproducibly isolated from nature without undue experimentation.

Exact replication of a plasmid is an unpredictable event. Although applicant has provided a written description of a method for selecting the claimed plasmids, this method will not necessarily reproduce plasmids which are chemically and structurally identical to those claimed.

Because one skilled in the art could not be assured of the ability to practice the invention as claimed in the absence of the availability of the plasmid, a suitable deposit for patent purposes, evidence of public availability of the pD2 RF-HN (ATCC 75388) or evidence of the reproducibility without undue experimentation is required.

If the deposit has been made under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty, filing of an affidavit or declaration by applicant or assignees or a statement by an attorney of record who has authority and control over the conditions of deposit over his or her signature and registration

Art Unit: 1645

number stating that the deposit has been accepted by an International Depository Authority under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty, that all restrictions upon public access to the deposit will be irrevocably removed upon the grant of a patent on this application and that the deposit will be replaced if viable samples cannot be dispensed by the depository is required. This requirement is necessary when deposits are made under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty as the Treaty leaves this specific matter to the discretion of each State. Amendment of the specification to recite the date of deposit and the complete name and full street address of the depository is required. As a possible means for completing the record, applicant may submit a copy of the contract with the depository for deposit and maintenance of each deposit.

If the deposits have not been made under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty, then in order to certify that the deposits comply with the criteria set forth in 37 CFR §1.801-1.809, assurances regarding availability and permanency of deposits are required. Such assurance may be in the form of an affidavit or declaration by applicants or assignees or in the form of a statement by an attorney of record who has the authority and control over the conditions of deposit over his or her signature and registration number averring:

(a) during the pendency of this application, access to the deposits will be afforded to the Commissioner upon request;

(b) all restrictions upon the availability to the public of the deposited biological material will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent on this application;

(c) the deposits will be maintained in a public depository for a period of at least thirty years from the date of deposit or for the enforceable life of the patent or for a period of five years after the date of the most recent request for the furnishing of a sample of the deposited biological material, whichever is longest; and

(d) the deposits will be replaced if they should become nonviable or non-replicable.

In addition, a deposit of biological material that is capable of self-replication either directly or indirectly must be viable at the time of deposit and during the term of deposit. Viability may be tested by the depository. The test must conclude only that the deposited material is capable of reproduction. A viability statement for each deposit of a biological material not made under the Budapest Treaty must be filed in the application and must contain:

- 1) The name and address of the depository;
- 2) The name and address of the depositor;
- 3) The date of deposit;
- 4) The identity of the deposit and the accession number given by the depository;
- 5) The date of the viability test;
- 6) The procedures used to obtain a sample if the test is not done by the depository; and

Art Unit: 1645

7) A statement that the deposit is capable of reproduction.

As a possible means for completing the record, applicant may submit a copy of the contract with the depository for deposit and maintenance of each deposit.

If the deposit was made after the effective filing date of the application for patent in the United States, a verified statement is required from a person in a position to corroborate that the hybridoma cell line described in the specification as filed is the same as that deposited in the depository. Corroboration may take the form of a showing of a chain of custody from applicant to the depository coupled with corroboration that the deposit is identical to the biological material described in the specification and in the applicant's possession at the time the application was filed.

Applicant's attention is directed to In re Lundack, 773 F.2d. 1216, 227 USPQ 90 (CAFC 1985) and 37 CFR §1.801-1.809 for further information concerning deposit practice.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 59-74 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 5,968,776. Although the

Art Unit: 1645

conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each set of claims is directed to hybrid genes encoding a HN_{PIV-3}-F_{RSV} fusion protein.

6. Claims 59-74 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,225,091. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each set of claims is directed to hybrid genes encoding a HN_{PIV-3}-F_{RSV} fusion protein.

7. Claim 65 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 61. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Navarro, whose telephone number is (703) 306-3225. The examiner can be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:00 AM - 6:00 PM. The examiner can be reached on alternate Fridays. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Lynette Smith can be reached at (703) 308-3909.

Art Unit: 1645

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1645 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1645 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the official Gazette 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CMI Fax Center number is (703) 308-4242.



Mark Navarro

Primary Examiner

July 2, 2001